

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 30, 2004, applicants submit the following remarks.

Claims 1-58 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 49-51, and 58 were withdrawn as being directed towards a nonelected invention. Applicants have amended claims 5, 7, 8, 45, and 46 to more particularly define the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments are fully supported and add no new matter. Claims 27 and 52-57 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

II. Summary of the Examiner's Action

Claims 45 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5-8, 11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28-39, 47, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marin et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,397,355 (hereinafter "Marin").

Claims 7, 9, 10, 14, 24, 42-46, 52-55, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kleshinski U.S. Patent No. 5,755,778 (hereinafter "Kleshinski").

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marin.

Claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marin in view of Lau et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,735,893 (hereinafter "Lau").

Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleshinski.

III. Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of
Claims 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the use of "perpendicular" in claim 45 was unclear and that "said certain angle" lacked antecedent basis in claim 46. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claims 45 and 46 to more particularly define the invention. The term "perpendicular" has been removed from claim 45, and the dependency of claim 46 has been corrected such that "said certain angle" has proper antecedent basis. Thus, claims 45 and 46 are not indefinite, and the rejection of

claims 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

IV. Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of
Claims 5-8, 11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28-39,
47, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8, 11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28-39, 47, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marin. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 5, 7, and 8 to more clearly define the invention. The amendment to these claims incorporates the features of dependent claim 27, which the Examiner identified as being allowable (12/30/04 Office Action, page 6). Thus, independent claims 5, 7, and 8 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, since claims 6, 11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28-39, 47, and 48 depend from independent claims 5, 7, and 8, the rejection of claims 6, 11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28-39, 47, and 48 should also be withdrawn. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5-8, 11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28-39, 47, and 48 be withdrawn.

V. Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of
Claims 7, 9, 10, 14, 24, 42-46, 52-55,
and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 10, 14, 24, 42-46, 52-55, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Kleshinski. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have cancelled claims 52-55 and 57 without prejudice, and applicants have amended independent claims 5, 7, and 8 to more clearly define the invention and to include features that the Examiner has identified as being allowable. Because dependent claims 9, 10, 14, 24, and 42-46 depend from allowable independent claims 5, 7, and 8, dependent claims 9, 10, 14, 24, and 42-46 are also allowable.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7, 9, 10, 14, 24, 42-46 be withdrawn.

VI. Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of
Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marin. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 5, 7, and 8 to more clearly define the invention and to include features that the Examiner has identified as being allowable. Thus, claim 15 now depends on allowable independent claims. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

VII. Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of
Claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marin in view of Lau. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 5, 7, and 8 to more clearly define the invention and to include features that the Examiner has identified as being allowable. Thus, claims 40 and 41 now depend on allowable independent claims. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

VIII. Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of
Claim 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)


The Examiner rejected claim 56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleshinski. Applicants have cancelled claim 56 without prejudice.

IX. Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-26 and 28-48 are allowable. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stuart W. Yothers", is written over a horizontal line.

Stuart W. Yothers
Registration No. 53,816
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000